

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: LUL 8582 Chase Brady pivot irrigation project: Lease # 3643

Proposed Implementation Date: spring 2008

Proponent: Chase Brady, 481 4th Land NE, Power, MT 59436. (406) 868-3693

Type and Purpose of Action: This proposal is for a ½ swing 320 acre pivot. The purpose of the pivot is to replace an existing wheel line system to conserve water, and improve production and efficiency. The swing on the pivot will cross trust lands with one tower, and irrigate approximately 21.4 acres of CRP.

Location: T23N, R 2W, Sec 35 NWNE
(Common Schools)

County: Teton

I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project. | DNRC, Surface owner
Carl Bremer, Surface Lessee
Chase Brady, Proponent |
| 2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED: | USDA – NRCS Federal CRP Contractor |
| 3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: | Deny the request |

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

RESOURCE	[Y/N]	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
N = Not Present or No Impact will occur. Y = Impacts may occur (explain below)		
4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compactable or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?		[N] This proposal lies within a large glaciated plain within the prolific Greenfield Irrigation District of the Fairfield Bench. The soils are deep and vary between silt and clay loam textures. The proposed pipeline and power system will cross deeded cultivated land within the parameters of the pivot. Water will transfer from the wheel line system to the pivot system. Water volume should be anticipated to be less. Reclamation will not be required. Cumulative impacts are not anticipated.

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?</p> | <p>[Y] The irrigation water is regulated and controlled by the Green Fields District who monitors water volumes and standards.
Cumulative impacts are not anticipated as a result of this action.</p> |
| <p>6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I air shed)? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?</p> | <p>[N] There will be no impact to the air shed as a result of this proposal.</p> |
| <p>7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?</p> | <p>[Y] The intent of this proposal is to increase crop production. Impacts are anticipated to be positive through increased commodity yields.</p> |
| <p>8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?</p> | <p>[N] There will not be any adverse impact to fish, wildlife, or birds resulting from this proposal. This proposal is anticipated to create better habitat for area wildlife. An irrigated stand of CRP should have 100% increases in vegetative cover versus a dry land stand.</p> |
| <p>9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?</p> | <p>[N] There are no endangered or threatened species or habitat present on this site.</p> |
| <p>10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?</p> | <p>[N] During the field inspection there were no historic sites found. The lease records also indicated no cultural sites present within the proposed area.</p> |
| <p>11. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?</p> | <p>[N] There are no prominent topographic features within the proposed area.</p> |
| <p>12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, and AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?</p> | <p>[N] Agriculture is basically the sole industry in the area. There are no anticipated cumulative impacts to other activities in the area resulting from this proposal.</p> |
| <p>13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of other private, state or federal current actions w/n the analysis area, or from future proposed state actions that are under MEPA review (scoping) or permitting review by any state agency w/n the analysis area?</p> | <p>[N] None</p> |

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[N] This project will not add to the health and safety of the area.
15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[N] This project will not alter adjacent operations.
16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number. Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[Y] This project will create a contracting job during the installation and excavation of the main line.
17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[Y] This project is anticipated to create additional tax revenue from increased production and sales.
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[Y] There will not be substantial traffic added to the area as a result of this project.
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N] None
20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[Y] There are no wilderness areas accessed through this tract.
21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] None
22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N] None
23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[N] None
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES: Is there a potential for other future uses for easement area other than for current management? Is future use hypothetical? What is the estimated return to the trust. Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[Y] This project will enhance the CRP stand, thus increasing wildlife habitat in the area. Return to the trust will be LUL revenue, and excellent wildlife habitat.

EA Checklist Prepared By: Steve Dobson LUS Conrad Unit Date: 4-1-08
Name Title

IV. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Approve LUL #8582.

26. SIGN4IFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

The applicant has applied for a LUL to cross state land wit the end of a center pivot. This benefits adjacent deeded land and allow the land owner to increase crop production and irrigation efficiently. The state land classification (CRP) will not be changed. Acres will still remain in CRP and under contract as such. The applicant has contacted our surface lessee and FSA for permission to cross, which has been granted. DNRC also contact FSA and notified them about this project. About 20 acre of CRP will be irrigated at no cost to the state or the surface lessee, which will benefit the stand production during dry times. Also, for future management, if this acreage is farmed, increase crop production would be realized. The will receive a one time rental of \$250.00 for this LUL. Overall, no negative environmental impacts are expected.

27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis:

☐ EIS ☐ More Detailed EA ☒ No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By: Erik Eneboe Conrad Unit Manager - CLO
Name Title

Signature April 14, 2008
Date

